

KINSELLA WEITZMAN ISER KUMP & ALDISERT LLP
 808 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, 3rd FLOOR
 SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90401
 TEL 310.566.9800 • FAX 310.566.9850

1 ROPES & GRAY LLP
 2 THAD A. DAVIS (SBN 220503)
 thad.davis@ropesgray.com
 Three Embarcadero Center
 3 San Francisco, CA 94111-4006
 Telephone: 415.315.6300
 4 Facsimile: 415.315.6350
 5 ROPES & GRAY LLP
 PETER M. BRODY (*pro hac vice*)
 6 peter.brody@ropesgray.com
 MARIEL GOETZ (*pro hac vice*)
 7 mariel.goetz@ropesgray.com
 700 12th Street, NW, Suite 900
 8 Washington, DC 20005-3948
 Telephone: 202.508.4612
 9 Facsimile: 202.383.7777
 10 KINSELLA WEITZMAN ISER KUMP & ALDISERT LLP
 MICHAEL J. KUMP (SBN 100983)
 11 mkump@kwikalaw.com
 LAURA D CASTNER (SBN 172362)
 12 lcastner@kwikalaw.com
 808 Wilshire Boulevard, 3rd Floor
 13 Santa Monica, California 90401
 Telephone: 310.566.9800
 14 Facsimile: 310.566.9850
 15 Attorneys for Counterclaim Defendant
 KIMBERLY KARDASHIAN
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

TRIA BEAUTY, INC., Plaintiff,

Case No. CV-10-5030 RS
 Honorable Richard Seeborg

vs.

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT

RADIENCY, INC., Defendant.

Date: May 10, 2012
 Time: 1:30 p.m.
 Crtm.: No. 3, 17th Floor

RADIENCY, INC., Counterclaim Plaintiff,

vs.

TRIA BEAUTY, INC., Counterclaim
 Defendant, and

KIMBERLY KARDASHIAN,

Counterclaim Defendant.

1 On April 5, 2010, Counterclaim-Defendant Kimberly Kardashian filed a Motion for
2 Summary Judgment or in the Alternative for Partial Summary Judgment pursuant to Rule 56 of the
3 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The motion was timely heard in Department 3 of the above-
4 captioned Court on May 10, 2012 at 1:30 p.m. Upon consideration of Ms. Kardashian's Motion,
5 and of the pleadings, declarations, exhibits, memoranda, and other supporting and opposing papers
6 submitted by the parties, the Court finds:

- 7 1. Count II of Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff Radiancy, Inc.'s ("Radiancy") First
8 Amended Counterclaims ("FACC") asserts a claim for false advertising under
9 California Business and Professions Code Section 17500 ("Section 17500"),
10 against Ms. Kardashian based on statements made while she was a spokesperson
11 for Plaintiff/Counterclaim-Defendant TRIA, Inc.'s ("TRIA") TRIA hair removal
12 laser product ("TRIA Laser").
- 13 2. Count III of Radiancy's FACC asserts a claim for unfair competition under
14 California Business and Professions Code Section 17200 ("Section 17200"),
15 against Ms. Kardashian based on statements made while she was a spokesperson
16 for the TRIA Laser.
- 17 3. As a matter of law, Radiancy cannot state a claim against Ms. Kardashian for an
18 "unfair" business practice within the meaning of Section 17200, because neither the
19 conduct alleged nor the evidence shows a threat of a violation of an antitrust law, or
20 has an effect comparable to a violation of antitrust law.
- 21 4. As a matter of law, Radiancy cannot state a claim against Ms. Kardashian for a
22 "fraudulent" business practice within the meaning of Section 17200, because with
23 respect to Ms. Kardashian, there is no admissible evidence that her statements
24 regarding the TRIA Laser are misleading to a reasonable consumer.
- 25 5. Radiancy cannot state a claim against Ms. Kardashian for an "unlawful" business
26 practice within the meaning of Section 17200, based on a violation of Section 5 of
27 the Federal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act"), 15 U.S.C. §45, or the FTC
28 Enforcement Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in

KINSELLA WEITZMAN ISER KUMP & ALDISERT LLP
808 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, 3rd FLOOR
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90401
TEL 310.566.9800 • FAX 310.566.9850

1 Advertising (the “FTC Guides”) because (a) there is no private right of action under
2 the FTC Act, and (b) the FTC Guides are not federal law.

- 3 6. Even if the FTC Act or the FTC Guides could support a claim under the “unlawful”
4 prong of Section 17200, the evidence does not support a finding that Ms.
5 Kardashian’s statements regarding the TRIA Laser violated Section 17200:
6 a. Radiancy does not claim, and the evidence does not show, that Ms.
7 Kardashian was a “direct participant” within the meaning of the FTC
8 Guides and *F.T.C. v. Garvey*, 383 F.3d 891 (9th Cir. 2004);
9 b. The evidence shows that Ms. Kardashian is not liable as an “endorser” of
10 the TRIA Laser within the meaning of the FTC Guides and *F.T.C. v.*
11 *Garvey*, 383 F.3d 891 (9th Cir. 2004);
12 c. The evidence shows that Ms. Kardashian was a bona fide user of the TRIA
13 Laser at the time when she made statements about the product;
14 d. The evidence shows that Ms. Kardashian’s statements regarding the TRIA
15 Laser reflected her honest opinions, findings, beliefs and experiences
16 regarding the product, as well as information she received from TRIA about
17 the product and publicly available information;
18 e. The evidence shows that Ms. Kardashian did not believe that any of the
19 statements she made regarding the TRIA Laser were untrue or would
20 mislead any consumers who heard or read her statements, and she did not
21 learn any information about the TRIA Laser that led her to believe that any
22 of her statements were untrue or would mislead any consumers who heard
23 or read her statements;
24 f. There is no evidence that Ms. Kardashian intentionally omitted making any
25 statements about the TRIA Laser in order to mislead or deceive consumers;
26 g. The evidence shows that Ms. Kardashian did not at any time intend to
27 mislead or deceive any of the consumers who might hear or read her
28 statements regarding the TRIA Laser;

- 1 h. There is no evidence that Ms. Kardashian intended to sell the TRIA Laser
2 by publicly disseminating advertising that she knew, or in the exercise of
3 reasonable care should have known, was untrue or misleading.
- 4 7. The evidence does not support a finding that Ms. Kardashian's statements
5 regarding the TRIA Laser violated Section 17500:
- 6 a. There is no evidence that Ms. Kardashian intended to sell the TRIA Laser
7 by publicly disseminating advertising that she knew, or in the exercise of
8 reasonable care should have known, was untrue or misleading;
- 9 b. The evidence shows that Ms. Kardashian was a bona fide user of the TRIA
10 Laser at the time when she made statements about the product;
- 11 c. The evidence shows that Ms. Kardashian's statements regarding the TRIA
12 Laser reflected her honest opinions, findings, beliefs and experiences
13 regarding the product, as well as information she received from TRIA about
14 the product and publicly available information;
- 15 d. The evidence shows that Ms. Kardashian did not believe that any of the
16 statements she made regarding the TRIA Laser were untrue or would
17 mislead any consumers who heard or read her statements, and she did not
18 learn any information about the TRIA Laser that led her to believe that any
19 of her statements were untrue or would mislead any consumers who heard
20 or read her statements;
- 21 e. There is no evidence that Ms. Kardashian intentionally omitted making any
22 statements about the TRIA Laser in order to mislead or deceive consumers;
- 23 f. The evidence shows that Ms. Kardashian did not at any time intend to
24 mislead or deceive any of the consumers who might hear or read her
25 statements regarding the TRIA Laser.

26 For the foregoing reasons, Ms. Kardashian is entitled to summary judgment in her favor on
27 Count II and Count III of Radiancy's First Amended Counterclaims.
28

1 **NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED THAT** Counterclaim-Defendant Kimberly
2 Kardashian's Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the Alternative for Partial Summary Judgment,
3 is **GRANTED** in its entirety, that Count II and Count III of Radiancy's First Amended
4 Counterclaims be and they hereby are dismissed with prejudice as to Ms. Kardashian, and that
5 Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff Radiancy, Inc. take nothing for its Counterclaims against Ms.
6 Kardashian.

7

8

9 DATED: May ___, 2012

10

11

HON. RICHARD SEEBORG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12

13

14 *Presented by:*

15

16

17 KINSELLA WEITZMAN ISER KUMP
& ALDISERT LLP

18

ROPS & GRAY LLP

19

20 Attorneys for Counterclaim-Defendant
Kimberly Kardashian

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

KINSELLA WEITZMAN ISER KUMP & ALDISERT LLP
808 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, 3rd FLOOR
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90401
TEL 310.566.9800 • FAX 310.566.9850